AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

[H.A.S.C. No. 115–107]

HEARING

ON

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

AND

OVERSIGHT OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS HEARING

ON

ARMY FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET REQUEST READINESS POSTURE

HEARING HELD
APRIL 19, 2018

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

30–694 WASHINGTON : 2019

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

JOE WILSON, South Carolina, *Chairman*

ROB BISHOP, Utah
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona, *Vice Chair*
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee
TRENT KELLY, Mississippi
MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin

MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
A. DONALD MCEACHIN, Virginia
SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California
ANTHONY G. BROWN, Maryland
STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, Florida
RO KHANNA, California

ANDREW WARREN, *Professional Staff Member*
BRIAN GARRETT, *Professional Staff Member*
MEGAN HANDAL, *Clerk*

CONTENTS

Page

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Bordallo, Hon. Madeleine Z., a Delegate from Guam, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Readiness 2
Wilson, Hon. Joe, a Representative from South Carolina, Chairman, Subcommittee on Readiness 1

WITNESSES

Anderson, LTG Joseph, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3/5/7, U.S. Army 3
Kadavy, LTG Timothy, USA, Director, Army National Guard, U.S. Army 5
Luckey, LTG Charles, USA, Chief of Army Reserve, U.S. Army 6
Piggee, LTG Aundre, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–4, U.S. Army 4

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:
Anderson, LTG Joseph, joint with LTG Aundre Piggee, LTG Timothy Kadavy, and LTG Charles Luckey 30
Wilson, Hon. Joe 29

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
Army EDI Information Paper 45

WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:
Mr. Brown 49

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:
Mr. Scott 53

ARMY FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET REQUEST READINESS POSTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS,
Washington, DC, Thursday, April 19, 2018.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Joe Wilson (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOE WILSON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

Mr. WILSON. Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. The Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee of Readiness will come to order. I welcome you to this hearing of the House Armed Services Committee Readiness Subcommittee on the United States Army readiness posture.

Today the subcommittee will hear from four Army senior leaders regarding their service's fiscal year 2019 budget request in correlation to current and future readiness across the total Army.

We are grateful to have the Regular Army component, the Army National Guard, and Army Reserve so superbly represented. And I was grateful to point out to each that I have served in the Regular Army, the Guard, and Reserve. So I am particularly grateful to be here with you. You truly embody the integration of the total Army.

I want to take this opportunity to sincerely thank our witnesses for their service. A combined 144 years of service is seated before us today.

Specifically, I would like to explore the shortfalls, gaps, and critical challenges that lie ahead as you continue to implement the Army's readiness recovery plan. We also want to recognize the progress achieved thus far and gain a better understanding of how the fiscal year 2019 budget request enables critical warfighting capabilities and life-cycle sustainment. Ultimately, how does this budget request support the Army mission and those men and women who wear the uniform and are in harm's way.

The fiscal year 2019 base and overseas contingency operations budget request for total Army operation and maintenance includes $70 billion, an approximate $4 billion above the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act [NDAA] amount.

We appreciate the Army's prioritization of readiness and efforts to train towards decisive action capabilities, increased global posture and capacity and lethality to defeat the threats identified in

the National Defense Strategy [NDS], but we recognize there is more work to be done. It is our responsibility as members of the subcommittee to understand the readiness situation and how the budget request impacts the Army in correcting deficiencies and restoring the capabilities this Nation needs.

President Ronald Reagan frequently used the term "peace through strength." I agree with President Reagan and believe we must maintain a high state of readiness across our armed services in order to achieve that goal, as also has been restated by President Donald Trump.

Needless to say, we have a lot of ground to cover this morning. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today on varying aspects of Army readiness and concrete ways this committee can help.

Before I introduce the witnesses, I turn to Ranking Member Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo, distinguished lady from Guam, for opening comments she would like to make.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wilson can be found in the Appendix on page 29.]

STATEMENT OF HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, A DELEGATE FROM GUAM, RANKING MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And a warm "hafa adai" to all of the witnesses, since most of you have been on Guam. I want to thank you for testifying here today and thank you all for your leadership within your respective organizations as well as your service to our great Nation.

I especially look forward to the service posture hearings and hearing from leaders within the various branches on your plans for the coming years, the challenges that you face, and how we, the Members of Congress, can help you surmount these challenges.

And I do realize that we have had to reschedule this hearing several times over the past couple of months, and I appreciate the witnesses being flexible and making themselves available to be here today.

Restoring our military's readiness has been identified as a priority for the Department of Defense as well as for this subcommittee. At previous hearings, I have expressed concern with the other service budget request and their focus on modernization accounts rather than the operations and maintenance accounts that support training, maintenance, and building blocks for military readiness.

However, I am pleased to see the Army's budget request appears to reflect some increases in the operations and maintenance accounts over and above the fiscal year 2018 levels. That being said, I still have questions on the Army's budget request, and I look forward to hearing specifically how this budget will support the Army's readiness recovery.

I note that the Army's unfunded requirements list did not include items related to training, maintenance, or near-term readiness recovery. So this suggests that you believe the budget request fully resources your near-term readiness recovery plans.

However, given the readiness shortfalls driven by sequestration and budget uncertainty, I wonder if the Army would be able to ex-

pend additional resources for depot maintenance, supply, training, and other key readiness-enabling accounts in fiscal year 2019.

This committee wants to support your efforts to rebuild readiness and recover from the budget uncertainty caused by sequestration and continuing resolutions. So we do hope that today's hearing helps provide more details on the Army's near-term and long-term readiness recovery plans as we move toward markup of the fiscal year 2019 NDAA.

So, again, welcome to you all, and I look forward to your testimony.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you, Congresswoman Bordallo.

I am pleased to recognize our witnesses today. I want to thank them for taking the time to be here with us.

We have Lieutenant General Joseph Anderson, the Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3. We have Lieutenant General Aundre Piggee, the Deputy Chief of Staff. We are grateful to have Lieutenant General Timothy Kadavy, the Director, Army National Guard; and Lieutenant General Charles Luckey, the Chief of Army Reserve.

And before I begin, I would like to remind each witness that we have your written statement that has been submitted for the record, and if you could summarize your comments to 5 minutes or less. And then we will proceed to members asking questions. Thank you very much.

Beginning with General Anderson.

STATEMENT OF LTG JOSEPH ANDERSON, USA, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G–3/5/7, U.S. ARMY

General ANDERSON. Chairman Wilson, Ranking Member Bordallo, distinguished members of the subcommittee, thanks for the opportunity to testify on the readiness of the U.S. Army. And thanks to all of you for your continued support and demonstrated commitment to our soldiers, civilians, families, and veterans.

Today, your Army remains globally engaged, with over 187,000 trained and ready soldiers committed to meeting combatant command deterrence and counterterrorist requirements.

This demand falls disproportionately on the Army. We meet 50 percent of the combatant command base demand and 70 percent of emergent demand. To maintain this tempo and sustain readiness at levels required to support contingency plans, the Army must accept risk in end strength, capable capacity, sustainment, and modernization.

Readiness for ground combat is and will remain the Army's first priority. Our Army is focusing resources to maximize readiness and those units most likely to respond to possible contingencies around the world. We are also focusing on the increasing integration of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve.

We appreciate the bipartisan effort that produced the 2-year budget agreement for fiscal years 2018 and 2019. That type of certainty must continue well into the future so that we can effectively plan and align our resources with our top priorities.

The National Defense Strategy focuses on the return of great power competition, where the Army will face a more technically capable adversary on a more lethal battlefield. The Army is expand-

ing, building, and manning new units to meet the demand for areas such as security force assistance, cyber and EW [electronic warfare] capabilities, and piloting new operating concepts such as the new Multi-Domain Task Force.

We appreciate the opportunity to grow the Army to 1.025 million soldiers. I look forward to continuing to work with Congress to ensure that the young men and women who make extraordinary sacrifices on behalf of our Nation are not sent into harm's way without being given what they need to be ready.

I look forward to answering your questions. Thanks again for your time and attention.

[The joint prepared statement of General Anderson, General Piggee, General Kadavy, and General Luckey can be found in the Appendix on page 30.]

Mr. WILSON. General Anderson, thank you very much.

And General Piggee.

STATEMENT OF LTG AUNDRE PIGGEE, USA, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G–4, U.S. ARMY

General PIGGEE. Chairman Wilson, Ranking Member Bordallo, and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify today.

I echo General Anderson's comments. Your support is essential for readiness, and the Army needs it more now than ever. Efforts like the 2-year bipartisan budget agreement are game changers for readiness and future planning, but 2 years won't get us where we need to be. This predictability has [to] become the norm.

The Army is thinking ahead now. As you just heard from General Anderson, the Army is doing a lot. As the Army G–4, it is my job to predict what soldiers will need, where they will need it, and how much to give them to make sure they can do all of those things that General Anderson spoke about.

We are looking at where to preposition our most critical equipment for the beginning of a conflict and how to maintain and store it to be ready for combat within hours.

We are assessing our industrial base and looking at our skills of our workforce and what skills that they require, the infrastructure and equipment in our facilities, and thinking about how we should modernize to meet future demands.

We are making progress to ensure we have enough of our preferred munitions in the right places, but there is more work to be done. We are working with our industry partners to ensure our supply chain is responsive and capable to meet our needs. And we are maintaining our equipment in a higher state of readiness to meet higher OPTEMPO [operations tempo] demands.

None of this is possible without the ability to plan ahead. We are committed to being ready, but we need your support to make that happen.

Thanks again for this opportunity to testify today and your continued support for our soldiers and our families, and I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, General.

And now we proceed to General Kadavy.

STATEMENT OF LTG TIMOTHY KADAVY, USA, DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD, U.S. ARMY

General KADAVY. Good morning, Chairman Wilson, Ranking Member Bordallo, distinguished members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the total Army readiness.

On behalf of the 343,500 Army National Guard soldiers, we thank you especially for your strong support and unwavering commitment to our soldiers, their families, our wounded warriors, and especially the families of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Your Army National Guard is mobilized today with more than 19,000 soldiers supporting combatant commanders both overseas and in the homeland. Before the end of this fiscal year, we anticipate mobilizing a total of more than 24,000 Army National Guard soldiers for high-profile United States Army missions, including Operation Spartan Shield in the Middle East and the enhanced forward posture mission in Europe.

Here at home, we currently have approximately 3,800 Army National Guard soldiers supporting Governors and States, as well as, as we have all heard in the news recently, an additional 951 Army National Guard soldiers recently called to duty on the southwest border.

Readiness continues to be our number one priority. Everything we do must support this priority. After losing readiness to budget reductions, repeated continuing resolutions, and a drawdown in end strength, the Army National Guard, with your help, is now on a solid path to recover this lost readiness.

We continually build readiness through balanced manning, training, and equipping strategies. Our modernization efforts nested with the Army's plan include recapturing readiness through modernizing our mission command systems, air defense artillery, Humvees, tanks, and aircraft.

Full-time support personnel continue to be the number one most critical contributors to both individual and unit readiness in the Army National Guard. Our full-time personnel perform vital mandatory missions, from training and administrative support to supply and maintenance of our critical platforms within the Army National Guard.

These hardworking soldiers are truly the foundation that makes us the most capable, best prepared combat reserve force in the world. Without these dedicated full-time-serving soldiers, we would simply not achieve the readiness required by the Army and by the Nation.

Individual readiness includes professional military education, medical and dental readiness, and individual weapons qualification.

With almost half of the Army's combat structure residing in the Army National Guard, our enhanced readiness initiatives will render the Army, in our view, sufficiently responsive to national defense needs.

We thank the committee for our increase in our end strength of 343,500. This allowed the Army National Guard to increase our readiness enhancement account created in the fiscal year 2017 NDAA, allowing us to focus on our high-priority units.

We are also grateful that in the fiscal year 2019 budget it includes the growth of 441 additional recruiters to fill positions in our community-based Army National Guard across the Nation.

This year, we begin to recapture readiness and improve lethality by implementing the foundational elements of Army Guard 4.0, thanks to strong support from Congress, the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and all 54 of our adjutant generals.

In our efforts to reclaim lost readiness in fiscal year 2017, we went to a 4-year training model for armored brigade and Stryker brigade combat teams and other urgent formations. This year, we will double our combat training center rotations from two to four. And at the end of this fiscal year, September 30, more than 30,000 Army National Guard soldiers will have trained at the United States Army's premier training centers during this fiscal year.

We have also increased the money for professional education for our commissioned officers and our noncommissioned officers.

Overall, this readiness strategy will require additional training days for many of our soldiers.

Your support keeps the Army National Guard warfighting-capable and Governor-responsive. In short, we are part of the Army's operational force, and we greatly appreciate all you have done to support us.

Thank you for allowing me to speak here today. And thank you for all that you do for our citizen soldiers, their families, their employers, and the civilians of the Army National Guard. I look forward to your questions.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, General.

We now proceed to General Luckey.

STATEMENT OF LTG CHARLES LUCKEY, USA, CHIEF OF ARMY RESERVE, U.S. ARMY

General LUCKEY. Chairman Wilson, Ranking Member Bordallo, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning.

It is an honor for me to represent the some 200,000 soldiers and civilians of America's Army Reserve who serve, as I speak, in 20 time zones around the world. And on behalf of them and their families, I want to thank each of you for your support.

With a presence in 50 States, 5 U.S. territories, and 30 countries around the world, your Army Reserve is becoming the most capable combat-ready and lethal Federal reserve force in the history of the United States of America.

Over the past year, we have continued to refine our Ready Force X [RFX] construct as the driver and intellectual forcing function for all aspects of manning, training, and equipping our formations and deploying key capabilities on compressed timelines. As I tell our troops, RFX is a verb, not a noun.

At its core, Ready Force X does two things. First, it is a way of seeing ourselves as a force from a readiness perspective with high fidelity within the context of Joint Staff-validated war plans. It enables us to prioritize activities and target policies to get after manning, training, and equipping formations, and early deploying capabilities prior to mobilization. In essence, it anticipates and priori-

tizes what needs to be done first in order to dramatically reduce post-mobilization timelines.

Second, it forces commanders at echelon to realistically assess the amount of time they will need to finalize the preparation of their units for combat post-mobilization and to commit to timelines that are measured in days and weeks. This is essential because it enables us to articulate and mitigate both risk to mission and risk to force by clearly assessing the criticality of mobilizing, making mobilization decisions well before we expect some units to arrive in theater fully combat-ready.

As America's Army Reserve becomes more capable and ready over time, we also remain consistently ready for our Defense Support of Civil Authorities missions and responsibilities here in the homeland at a moment's notice.

Last year, leveraging its immediate response authority, your Army Reserve conducted hundreds of missions to evacuate and rescue thousands of citizens in need, to transport emergency responders and airlift lifesaving medical supplies, to generate power, purify water, open ports and clear roads, delivering food, water, and supplies in support of operations responding to [hurricanes] Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

That said, readiness remains this team's number one priority. We are well on our way to more than doubling down on last year's production of Operation Cold Steel—at that time, our largest crew-served weapons gunnery exercise in the history of the United States Army Reserve. This year, Cold Steel II, conducted over 9 months at multiple locations, triples the throughput of our key enablers' key capabilities and increases the scope, complexity, and throughput of complex formations as they aggressively produce readiness for America's Army. From 1908 until today, America's Army Reserve has never done what it is doing now to get formations ready to go to combat.

As we look to the future, your Army Reserve continues to assess shifting demographics in emerging markets as we position and posture structure to ensure that we continue to leverage and share the best talent in America with employers across the Nation.

Targeting in some cases digital key terrain, your Army Reserve is driving to exploit its Private Public Partnership program to develop and expand unique employment relationships with the private sector as a screening force for the Army.

Creating new structure and moving it to key regions to gain and retain talent in areas such as cyber operations, quantum computing, and artificial intelligence, your Army Reserve team works closely with the Defense Innovation Unit-Experimental—that is, the DIUx—and MD5—that is the Military District 5 here in Washington with the Department of Defense—and other critical defense-oriented industries. This initiative is already well underway and bearing fruit.

In closing, I encourage each of you to continue to reach out to the communities, cities, campuses, and employers in your districts and to influence the influencers with the sound of your voice. Let them know that we appreciate their full partnership in the national security of the United States of America. They are sharing the best talent in the world with America's Army Reserve. We

could not generate the capability that we do for the Nation without their continued and sustained support. It is essential if we are going to continue to be ready enough to be relevant but not so ready that our soldiers are unable to keep good, meaningful civilian jobs and healthy, sustaining family lives.

On behalf of my entire team, we appreciate you, your support, and your leadership. I look forward to your questions.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, General Luckey.

And we will proceed now. And Drew Warren, our professional staff member, will maintain the 5 minutes for each person, beginning with me.

So, at this time, first of all, I want to thank each of you, but, General Luckey, when you were referencing hurricane recovery and relief, how important that is. We see how important it is in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the Caribbean, certainly the catastrophic effects to the hurricanes on the East Coast and the Gulf Coast. So there is such an emphasis on overseas operations, but domestically, how important it is.

And I am really grateful for the leadership of President Trump, to have National Guard personnel on the border to reduce drug trafficking, the potential of terrorists crossing, human trafficking, how important that is, and I am really grateful. One of my sons served in the Army Guard on the border at Arizona, and he told me how helpful it was to back up to the Border Patrol and how effective this can be. So, over and over again, we can see a potential positive, domestically and overseas.

General Anderson, what is the status and planned timelines for the six security force assistance brigades? And how has the Army ensured that the first of these units was sufficiently manned, trained, and equipped for deployment to Afghanistan, particularly given the accelerated schedule?

General ANDERSON. Thanks, Chairman.

Well, the good thing is they were originally supposed to go in November and they ended up going in February. So, if we had really had to get them out the door by November, we would have been challenged from a manning, equipping, and training, because their validation exercise at Fort Polk wasn't until January.

So the good news is, Congressman, they are on the ground. They are out in about 36 different locations supporting both kandaks [Afghan National Army battalions], brigade and corps headquarters, institutional training sites, and NSOC Alpha [NATO Special Operations Component Command Afghanistan]. So they are very well-dispersed. We will start to get feedback on how they are doing here soon, because they have been out about a week now.

Number two is being stood up at Fort Bragg. That should be fully up and running by summertime. And then number three, at a location to be determined, we will start this up this summer and should be finalized by the fall.

So the first three will be done by the end of calendar year 2018, and then we will work on four and five in the Active Component in 2019, and we will work on the Guard in 2019.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much.

And, General Piggee, I was very pleased as you were referencing the recent budget predictability, the ability to plan ahead, the lead-

ership of President Donald Trump. Secretary James Mattis, what a positive influence. And then someone that we appreciate, who we will miss, is Speaker Paul Ryan. He truly was impacted by different briefings that have been provided to him, and his leadership made it possible for the budget to pass.

Can you, General, please discuss the current and future plans for modernization command? And do you see any potential friction between the leadership within the modernization command and existing commands?

General PIGGEE. Thank you for your question. And, again, we really appreciate your support in the past and as we go forward.

I think that the modernization command will be an extension of the readiness challenges and be focused more on what those specific requirements are as they look to assist in acquisition reform and modernization of specific pieces of equipment.

And I think it fills a seam and a gap that we have not had in previous organizational structure, as we had multiple organizations touching various aspects of a life cycle of a piece of equipment. With this Futures Command, I think we will have from grave to cradle—or cradle to grave. We will have one organization responsible for overall acquisition of that process.

So I think it will be much more efficient and effective as we go forward.

Mr. WILSON. Well, we appreciate your leadership very much.

And a final question, General Anderson. One of the highlights of my life was, last August, to lead a delegation to Bucharest, Romania, to Sofia, Bulgaria, to Vilnius, Lithuania, to Riga, Latvia, to Tbilisi, Georgia, to Zagan, Poland, to see the liberation of these countries. It is due to the American military that the countries that I visited, each one, is free and the people are living in freedom today.

One of the highlights, I was with my son, who is an engineer in the Army Guard, and he arranged for a fellow graduate of U.S. Army Engineer School to meet us, a captain in the Lithuanian Army. Who would ever imagine in our lifetime? So thank you for your success.

And just a concern, though, that I have is the infrastructure of Central and Eastern Europe. And working together with the European Union, NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization], with the host countries, what do you see is the effort being made for the infrastructure, for the health and safety for everyone?

General ANDERSON. The good news is, Chairman, that Poland desires to make about a $2 billion investment in their infrastructure.

As you know if you went to the camp there where our brigade headquarters is, the barracks, the motor pool, and those conditions are a little not to our standards. But we knew that, because we knew the enhanced forward presence was going to be an expeditionary—it wasn't going to be like the FOBs [forward operating bases] you have been on in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So, over time, the goal will be to build that capability to support our—we are not looking for forward presence. We are looking for continued rotational capability from the heel-to-toe brigade for Operation Atlantic Resolve and sustaining the Enhanced Forward Presence Battle Group—is the NATO terminology with that bat-

talion, with a British infantry company, a Romanian air defense company, and a Croatian special forces asset. So it is a very good package.

Mr. WILSON. And I have seen the development of the M.K. [Mihail Kogalniceanu] Air Base——

General ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WILSON [continuing]. In Romania—remarkable——

General ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WILSON [continuing]. And Novo Selo in Bulgaria. To see young Bulgarians and Americans working together, how inspiring.

I now yield to Congresswoman Bordallo.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Lieutenant General Anderson, this question is for you. As I said in my opening statement, I am interested to hear your assessment of the fiscal year 2019 budget request given the readiness shortfalls that the Army has faced.

So, in your professional opinion, if additional funding was made available for operations and maintenance, do you believe the Army has areas where additional resources for these accounts would help accelerate readiness recovery? And can you please give an example?

General ANDERSON. Yes, ma'am.

The key on the O&M [operations and maintenance] funding you are talking about with respect to readiness is a function of maintaining our CTC [combat training center] rotations. So it is 19 a year this year. It goes to 20 a year next year. And we are trying to get repetitive, to get brigades back through there more than just once a year.

So that glide path from the validation exercise to enhanced home station training and an enhanced exercise program will help us keep recovering, like we are. A year ago right now, we had two brigades fully ready. Well, it is four times that much now. So that is great improvement over the course of the year.

The other part that I think you are referencing would be also all the maintenance piece. This is about having the parts as we try to enhance our readiness rates and modernization. Those have both fallen behind. But if we can have more standard stockage lists and have them all around the country, available, to reduce shipping times and parts to put on the vehicles, aircraft, et cetera, that is where that money would come, more investment in those types of things.

Ms. BORDALLO. Good. Thank you, General.

My second question is for General Kadavy. And this is the National Guard, of course.

When you last visited me, you mentioned that the Guard was still evaluating a proposal to have the Guam National Guard assume some portion of the THAAD [Terminal High Altitude Area Defense] mission.

I recently spoke with the Chief of Staff of the Army, and he thought it made sense to have the Guam Guard support the mission and allow the Army to save money by not having to deploy other units from their home station, many thousands of miles, to perform tasks that the Guam Guard was perfectly capable of assuming. In this way, the Army would not have to find housing for

the families—some are with families—the cost of travel, and other expenses.

So what is the status of your assessment? And can you find someone that can come by my office and update me on the findings?

General KADAVY. Well, hafa adai, Congresswoman.

Ms. BORDALLO. Hafa adai.

General KADAVY. We agree with you. We are in the process of running through the analysis to determine which pieces of that particular mission fits squarely into the structure and end strength that the Guam Army National Guard——

Ms. BORDALLO. I think we had the security, General, right?

General KADAVY. Right. Security, maintenance, supply, logistics are certainly things that reside in Guam. And, between us and the G–3, we are working diligently to determine what that need is so that we can move it forward.

And we would be more than happy to come by and give you an update on that, Congresswoman.

Ms. BORDALLO. In my opinion, it would be a great savings, because right now we are bringing them in from the States.

General KADAVY. Right, a great savings, but just a tremendous way to continue to develop readiness in our Guam Army National Guard, as well, Congresswoman.

Ms. BORDALLO. That is right.

Lieutenant General Anderson, my next question is for you. The Army Chief of Staff has called on the Army to prepare for war on the future battlefield and move away from the focus on counterinsurgency operations that have consumed the Army's focus for the last two decades.

Can you give examples of how the Army will leverage this year's budget request in regards to training to ensure soldiers continue to be prepared to meet global counterterror operations while pivoting to fulfill General Milley's intent?

General ANDERSON. Yes, ma'am. We are still required to perform the CT [counterterrorism] mission. That won't go away, principally because of Iraq, Afghanistan, and places like Syria.

But what you are talking about is how do we—as I mentioned the combat training center rotations a little while ago, these become full-spectrum rotations, which means—and the other term you will hear is "decisive action," whether it is a combined-arms maneuver, wide-area security. But this is air-ground integration, this is fires, this is obstacle belts, so electronic warfare, cyber, information operations, things that we hadn't done out there in years, where you actually shut down a network and that brigade has to actually maneuver without radios.

So that is what the chief has told us to do, make these as hard as we can against near-peer/peer competitors like Russia, like China, like North Korea, and be able to fight on that kind of a battlefield. And that is exactly what is happening in home stations, training centers. And our exercises are designed exactly the same way.

Ms. BORDALLO. Well, good. That answers my question.

And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congresswoman Bordallo.

We now proceed to Congressman Austin Scott of Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Piggee, Chairman Wilson mentioned Futures Command. It is my understanding that Atlanta is a finalist on the list that is yet to be—I don't think the final determination has been made yet of where that Futures Command will be. But I want to point out that there is uniform support from every Georgia Member for putting that Futures Command in Atlanta, and certainly we would love to have it there. The Army has been good to Georgia, and I think Georgia has also been good to the Army, and look forward to expanding that relationship, if possible.

General PIGGEE. Thank you, Congressman. I concur. And I do believe, just recently, the Under [Under Secretary of the Army] released the list of the 15 potential candidates, and I think Atlanta was one of that 15. I know that the G–3 was talking about in Georgia recently—I was in there last month, and my daughter lives in Atlanta.

Mr. SCOTT. Ah. Great.

General PIGGEE. I went to college there. So I am well aware of all of the ambience and capability that exists, technology that exists in that great State and in Atlanta in particular. And I am sure that it will get its due rigorous evaluation as we review all of the potential candidates.

Mr. SCOTT. So which school was she at?

General PIGGEE. She went to Clark Atlanta.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, there are a tremendous number of great institutions in Atlanta, and certainly glad you were there.

I know, General Anderson, you were also at Benning this week. First Security Forces Brigade was set up there. I hope that the third potentially can come to Fort Stewart. I would love to have that there.

And my question on the security forces brigades is, can you kind of speak to the differences in the organizations of the security force brigade versus traditional brigade combat team and how they are aiding in our readiness as a Nation as a whole?

General ANDERSON. Sure, Congressman.

The SFAB [security force assistance brigade] is structured off of an infantry brigade combat team table of organization, so it is 816 people. It has the entire structure of a brigade, E–5 and above. There are no lieutenants, and there are no E–4s and below. And they are capable of manning 36 12-man maneuver adviser teams.

So, as we are employing them over there right now, they are pretty much being employed as we design them but not necessarily totally, because some of them are doing institutional, and some of them are supporting special operations teams over there as well. So we will see at the end if we have to make any modifications as we build the second and third.

And, as you know, Congressman, the goal was, once these SFABs got employed over there, it would relieve—back to your readiness question—it would relieve brigade combat team presence there, and we would bring them home. Currently, because of the fight going on there and Afghanistan being the number one priority right now in CENTCOM [United States Central Command], the two brigades that are on the ground remained. And the question

will have to be—we are looking at options next calendar year when we do the turnover.

So first brigade will come home in November. We think the second brigade will go winter, and the third brigade will go spring. And the question will be will they both go. Because this year the challenge was, enabler-wise, when it came to medevac, ISR [intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance], logistics, et cetera, there wasn't enough enablers on the ground, air, to support two SFABs.

So we will see if they both go and, at the end of the day, do we yield a brigade combat team back. And that is when we will start recovering readiness from a demand perspective, which we have not realized that yet.

Mr. SCOTT. Sure. We have to have our brigade combat teams, but just, as I look at the world, you know, even if you just take—I mean, Africa is a billion people, just that one continent. You know, our ability to train, advise, assist and to put enough power into an area to have a big impact is going to become more and more important in the future. And I think that an organization smaller than a full-size BCT [brigade combat team], I think we are going to become more dependent on them in the future.

So, gentlemen, as you know, Fort Gordon has the Cyber Center of Excellence. I will mention it is in Georgia. Georgia has been good to the Army; the Army has been good to Georgia.

But, as we talk about cyber going forward, what steps are in the fiscal year 2019 budget to push the cyber capabilities to the tactical level to enable a multi-domain battle?

General ANDERSON. It is a total Army approach. So you know about the 61 Cyber Mission Force teams that we have out there. Not all fully operational yet, but the 41 Active are. And the Guard and Reserve are catching up.

But the key now, Congressman, is how do we operationalize cyber. So, at the strategic level, the National Mission Force, the Cyber Protection Brigade, both in the Guard and the Active, are all fully doing business. The issue is, how do you get this at corps and below. And that is the future growth that will occur fiscal year 2019 and beyond, is getting the cyber cells at brigade level, but how do you give brigade commanders operational capability to do things like knock a power grid, a water grid off the map without having to shoot around. That is where we are driving our training and capabilities, which right now don't exist.

Mr. SCOTT. Sure. Thank you.

My time has expired.

General KADAVY. If I could just add to that real quickly, the Army National Guard has also provided all 50 States, 3 territories, and District of Columbia an element we call the Defensive Cyber Operations Element to help protect the military network that goes into each one of the States and then also provide a capability to assist the States and local governments in cyber defense.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, Congressman Scott. And your testimony was so reassuring to all of us.

We now proceed to Congressman Anthony Brown of——

General ANDERSON. I am just confused, Chairman. What State is Congressman Scott from?

Mr. WILSON. Well, and the only thing—equally good, Fort Gordon is adjacent to Aiken, South Carolina. So, indeed, Congressman Scott was very prescient. I agreed with every word he said.

Now we proceed to somebody else I am sure I am going to agree with, Congressman Anthony Brown of Maryland.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen, for your presence here today and your leadership in the Army.

I had an opportunity to travel to Eastern Europe both in October and February. I was in Poland in October; I was with Representative Stefanik in Latvia, Estonia, and Ukraine and looked at some of the exciting things we are doing with the EDI, the European Deterrence Initiative.

I want to ask a little bit about our permanent presence in Europe, but let me preface with this: It is my understanding that the December 2017 GAO [Government Accountability Office] report found that the DOD [Department of Defense] is not estimating EDI's long-term sustainment costs or communicating their future costs to Congress.

We have a permanent presence. The vast majority of it is rotational, heel-to-toe. Some of it is permanent, I think a very small slice. There have been comments from senior leadership about wanting a more forward presence of a greater percentage, some maybe aviation units.

It is hard for policy makers to understand how we can support that mission if we don't have the data that we have been asking for. So this is more of a comment. Please provide us the data as soon as we can have it.

So I know that there are costs associated with a forward presence versus rotational. You have commissaries, you have schools. I also know that some of our allies are willing to bear the cost—and they already are—in delivering the infrastructure that would support a forward presence versus a rotational.

My question is, when will the Army assess long-term costs for that permanent presence so that we can better compare the costs of rotational versus forward stationing of forces?

And I know that General Anderson will take the bulk of that response, but I would also like to know, what is the impact on the Reserves and the Guard in terms of your getting your reps [repetitions] in if we go to forward versus rotational?

General ANDERSON. Perfect, Congressman. Thanks. And the Guard will send their first—278 ACR [Armored Cavalry Regiment] will be the next rotation for EFP [Enhanced Forward Presence], but Tim can talk about that.

We will give you all that. We have an EDI white paper, and the EDI white paper lays out all things Europe, from a MILCON [military construction] exercise, rotational force, build partnership capacity—all the elements of EDI.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on pages 45 and 49.]

General ANDERSON. Our experience, Congressman, tells us, though, that what we have learned, when we started heel-to-toe rotations with 3rd Brigade, 4th ID [Infantry Division] last year and

now 2nd Brigade, 1st ID this year, the readiness built by doing rotational forces versus permanent station is 10 times as powerful.

And the bottom line is our commanders on the ground—we rotate forces through Kuwait, Europe, and the peninsula. And every commander says that rotational force is a more ready force than, in this case, 2CR [2nd Cavalry Regiment] and 173rd, the two Europe-stationed forward presence brigades.

So that is why we do it, because we learn everything from port to foxhole, by rail, by convoy, by ship, all the border crossings, all the maneuver. And at the end of the day, it makes our Army so much better when we do it that way versus permanently stationed.

We are increasing air defense over there. We are increasing fires over there. We are most likely going to put a corps headquarters over there. That is all in the works. So there will be some forward stationing.

Mr. BROWN. Let me just jump in here, and I know that maybe the response from the Guard and Reserves I will have to get in writing or in follow-up conversations.

But, you know, I am always defending the cost of our services to my constituents. They say, hey, you take the second, you know, top eight spenders, Russia, China, et cetera, et cetera, they don't add up to the United States. And I say, well, that is because we have an expeditionary force, we have long logistics trails, we are bringing the fight to other continents. So we don't have—we have the cost and the benefit of being in the Western Hemisphere.

But, again, we need not just the year-to-year costs of rotational versus permanent; we need the long-term costs. I get the readiness. I grew up in 1985 Army when we were defending the Fulda Gap, and we had 300,000 uniformed personnel in Germany, and we thought that we were ready to defend. And I get the readiness piece.

But there is a cost to that readiness versus a permanent presence. And it would be good for Congress to have that comparison and that information. And it is my understanding that we are not getting that long-term estimation. We are getting year to year. We need long term.

I come out of the 1985 school where I want to see more permanent presence, so—or more forward presence. So show me the numbers, and I can compare them to your readiness evaluations as well.

Mr. Chairman, I have used up all my time. I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you very much, Congressman Brown.

We now proceed to Congresswoman Elise Stefanik of New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had the honor of hosting Secretary Mark Esper at Fort Drum just a few weeks ago. And in our discussions with family members but also service members, he focused on the need to address things that were eating up our readiness. And one of the examples was online training.

What are some of those other examples of exercises, things that we are asking our men and women in uniform to do that are eating up the readiness?

And the reason I am asking this: Because our number one focus is on readiness recovery, how can we address that excess, whether it is training, exercises? I would love your perspective.

General ANDERSON. Ma'am, he has beaten me up over that every day—every day—just on email last night. Because he is at 1st Cav [Cavalry] Division right now, and he said the commanders are telling him, because of the European rotational requirements, behavioral health stuff, other medical issues, about 200 to 300 of our soldiers there probably aren't going to go because of theater requirements.

So, quickly, it depends on what authoritative documents you are talking about, but 350–1 is the Army self-inflicted training requirements. We have just reduced those now down to individual marksmanship, PT [physical training], battle drill, collective tasks, and took all the other mandatory training—and the Secretary is allowing commanders to accept risk to mission, risk to force.

It doesn't mean things like SHARP [Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention], EO [Equal Opportunity], suicide prevention, aren't important, but by us telling them to do that every year for an hour in a classroom, it is not working. So he is not a fan of that. He is not a fan of online training requirements like TRiPS [Travel Risk Planning System], so every time people want to go on leave or pass, they have to spend a whole day filling out this questionnaire, which takes forever. So he shut that off last week.

But then the bigger issue becomes, what are other theater-required issues? Like, at CENTCOM, the individual requirements are three pages long if you are going to deploy to the CENTCOM theater.

So we are working with OSD P&R [Office of the Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness], Mr. Wilkie's team, the Joint Staff, in trying to find out what would make, minus environmental/geographic issues like diseases and things, what would make Africa different than CENTCOM, different than Europe, for rollover drills and those kinds of things. But how do we get that litany of things down and say, hey, here is your basic requirements to get on an airplane and go.

So it is a holistic look at everything, but when I say everything, it is about a 73-page document with 900-something tasks that we have uncovered, that he has made us do, which is—we will go as fast as we can to give commanders more flexibility.

Ms. STEFANIK. Thank you for noting the importance of programs like SHARP. By addressing some of the mandatory online training, what I thought was particularly helpful, hearing from Secretary Esper and our men and women in uniform, was that we need to have principles that we practice every single day, not just broken down into an hour of taking an online training course.

My second question is about some of our future challenges when you look at 21st-century warfare. With the creation of Army Futures Command and the need to be ready for wars of tomorrow, how do you envision AI, artificial intelligence, being incorporated into the Army modernization priorities that you have already established?

General ANDERSON. It fits right in with everything we were talking about earlier, about all the multi—it is part of our Multi-Do-

main Task Force approach from an intel, cyber, electronic warfare, space perspective.

But just last week, Secretary McCarthy directed the G–2, ASA(ALT) [Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology] and myself to go out to Microsoft, and we are going to partner with industry to figure out how to go faster with AI, and not slower, as we incorporate what artificial intelligence will give our commanders sooner than later. So I think we are doing Amazon next week and we are doing Microsoft, like, a week or two later. But trying to learn from industry, who is so much further ahead of us on that, and figure out how to integrate into our training policies, et cetera.

Ms. STEFANIK. Great. I am glad to hear that. I think that is very important, particularly as we look at near-peer adversaries in terms of their investment when it comes to AI, and they really integrated it into their militaries, but also how they are approaching readiness in the 21st century and making sure that we have the capabilities we need.

Thank you.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congresswoman.

We will now proceed to a second round.

General Kadavy, I was so impressed with the State Partnership Program and would like to know what the status of the State Partnership Program is and what more can we do to help you.

On my visit with Prime Minister Boyko Borisov in Bulgaria, he just felt so comfortable with the National Guard troops working and training with his troops.

I had the opportunity to visit in Tbilisi, Georgia, a joint parachute jump. And it is very appropriate that the State partnership is the State of Georgia with the Republic of Georgia. And then, in South Carolina, we appreciate that South Carolina is associated with Colombia. And so, to have people from Columbia go to Colombia over and over again, there has been a thoughtfulness here that is just amazing.

And our State Guards being so professional, with their experience in Iraq, Afghanistan, now to serve around the world, it is so uplifting. And the American people need to know about this.

General KADAVY. Thank you, Congressman, for that question. State Partnership Program is very important to the adjutant generals and to the National Guard at the bureau level too.

My personal military opinion is that it has really grown over the years from what was originally intended to be an exchange, an engagement type program, to something that is under theater security cooperation. Our adjutant generals work very closely with the combatant commanders and with the Army service component commanders. So it is really a leverage now to not just do engagements but exercise and other partner type things.

The parachute jump with the Georgia National Guard. You talked about Bulgaria and Romania, and you think about the Tennessee and the Alabama Army National Guards, which are the State partners, respectively, to those two States, and their ability to leverage their experience and their relationships to enhance the

ability to help them develop their training, locations: Novo Selo, and I can't remember the other one.

Mr. WILSON. M.K. [[Mihail Kogalniceanu].

General KADAVY. Right. So they have worked very hard there. And we have rotated engineer units from Tennessee and Alabama through those locations again and again and again, and it has really helped U.S. Army Europe to engage and utilize those relationships. So I think it has come a long way. For what the cost is, I think it is very cost-effective.

Mr. WILSON. And I've identified that I really appreciate President Trump's efforts on the border with Mexico to block the potential terrorist crossing over the—stop the human trafficking, to stop drug importation. And with the recent deployment order, can you be specific as to the type of activities and functions that the Guard personnel will perform? How many personnel will be providing this mission, and will the Guard members be conducting law enforcement activities, and will they be armed?

General KADAVY. First, I think the President and the Secretary of Defense have authorized a ceiling of 4,000. I don't know where the final number will be. We are in support of the States and particularly also Custom and Border Patrol. There is a work group that works very closely between the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, that are validating the requirements along with the States. Most those missions are administrative, supportive, logistics, in support of CBP [Customs and Border Protection]. Also I think where our largest assistance is, is in aviation support in, you know, assisting Customs and Border Patrol as they do their mission there. At this point in time I'm not aware of anybody that is going to do direct law enforcement in support. I believe some Governors have authorized for self-defense, the carrying of weapons, but nothing in an offensive manner.

Mr. WILSON. I am really grateful that the Governor of South Carolina, Henry McMaster, has been supportive from day one of the initiative. And the Guard members, Adjutant General Bob Livingston, have just been so enthusiastic about the ability to serve.

I now yield to Congresswoman Bordallo.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Lieutenant General Piggee, members on both sides of the aisle have taken a great deal of interest in the Army prepositioned stock program, especially with respect to support for U.S. Forces Korea and for U.S. Army Europe.

So can you please briefly describe some of the initiatives that you are taking in fiscal year 2018 and then plan to undertake in fiscal year 2019 with respect to prepositioned stocks.

General PIGGEE. Yes, ma'am. Thank you for that question. And as you know, our prepositioned stocks continue to be extremely important and provide a level of deterrence with our potential enemies.

We have primarily focused on configuring our prepositioned stocks in a capacity where they are ready to fight tonight. By configuring them for combat, we think it can reduce our time to issue that equipment to units that will fall in from a month or more to days. Our goal is 96 hours. But without configuring that equipment to combat, for combat, we can't do that.

This budget allows us to do that. We have started that. We are in the process of converting those brigades in Europe and in the Pacific. We expect those to be complete this fiscal year, and then we will extend that to other locations, to include sustainment brigades, which we have not been able to attack, because we haven't had the resources to do that.

So this influx of additional budget will allow us to configure those prepositioned sets where they are prepared to fight tonight, able to transfer that equipment in hours vice weeks and almost months. And our major focus was initially Korea and in the European location.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, General.

And, General Anderson, I have another question for you. I would like to shift now from soldier readiness to theater missile defense and defense of our Nation. I see that the air and missile defense is your fifth modernization priority. Is that right?

General ANDERSON. [Nonverbal response.]

Ms. BORDALLO. And that the service is including nearly a billion dollars for missile defeat and defense enhancements.

Now, as you know, on Guam, we have a THAAD missile defense system. So can you please expand on changes to missile defense capabilities and how the budget allocations enhance national ballistic missile defense?

General ANDERSON. Yes, ma'am. Well, the key, as you know, we just put THAAD on the Korean Peninsula, which was a big additive to what was on Guam.

Ms. BORDALLO. It was quite a struggle.

General ANDERSON. It was, but a great news story at the end. So, from a THAAD perspective, that posture is set. The issue now is SHORAD [short-range air defense]. So the two other gaps that enhance or support ballistic missile defense are SHORAD and long-range fires. And those are what you also see, long-range precision fire, on that list of six modernization priorities.

And so between growing SHORAD capability back to division level, a SHORAD battalion per division, and working the long-range extension of the capability of fires from an offset perspective, those, combined with existing THAAD/Patriot capabilities, will ultimately be the way ahead.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you very much, General.

And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congresswoman Bordallo.

We now proceed to Congressman Austin Scott of Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT. General Luckey, we spoke briefly the other day about your components and the impact on employers and the families. One of my bigger concerns as we have dealt with CRs [continuing resolutions] and other things is when we look at the Guard and the Reserve Component, as those dates approach and your training has to be canceled, the opportunity to fill that time, in some cases, isn't there.

Could you speak to that issue briefly for us?

General LUCKEY. Yes, sir. So, Congressman, as we discussed the other day—and my guess is that General Kadavy would have a similar view. One of the challenges, as you well know, in having any sort of lapse in funding, and as we discussed the other day,

predictability, consistency is critical. In fact, I would say that, in some respects, a steady stream of less is better than, you know, episodic fluctuations of cash, and so I would just—financing.

So I would say, first of all, lapses in funding, as you well know, have significant impact for the Reserve Components. I will speak just to COMPO–3 [U.S. Army Reserve Component 3] because, unlike our Active Duty counterparts, the battle assembly weekends are disrupted when there is a lapse in funding.

Now, I want to give credit here to the G–3 [operations staff] of the Army, because one of the things, as I mentioned to you the other day, we did work our way through sort of those critical tasks which our formations inside America's Army Reserve had to continue to train to execute, admittedly for a short period of time during lapses in funding, but had to train. Because to lose that weekend for some of our formations—and as you well know, Congressman, that is one-twelfth of the year from a battle assembly perspective—to lose that one weekend can be absolutely devastating from a medical readiness perspective or for some other critical function that has to occur then, because we can't just put it off to the next week because we have employers we have to deal with. We have families we worry about. So it is critical we execute those functions.

So we have worked very closely, as a total Army, to make sure we are, at a minimum, making sure we put maximum focus on those critical things that have to happen and acknowledge that, in some other cases, I have to manage risk prudently.

So anything and everything that this body can do to ensure consistency in funding and no further lapses I think would be a significant impact from a readiness enhancement perspective for the Army Reserve. And my guess is my counterpart, General Kadavy, sees it no differently.

General KADAVY. If I could just add a couple things, Congressman. First, you know, I think we have all heard the Army National Guard Reserve Component model was 39 days a year, one weekend a month and 15 days in the summer. I believe our model, truthfully, is we share soldiers with families and employers, and predictability is a key part of maintaining that bond of trust with them. And so they make family arrangements and plans for the entire year around our schedule so their soldiers can participate in training.

And when we cancel something, two things happen: One, many of the families rely on the pay and allowances associated with that training period. They will not get that. Although the resources will come later in the year, we do have the drill, but now they have to change plans in order to attend that additional drill period later in the year. So that impacts families. I agree with General Luckey: Our dental and medical readiness was impacted. We do a lot of that during the times of the years that the CRs—but the other thing is, as we build training strategies, it is a building upon one training event to another training event to another training event. So we miss it, and it messes up the strategies. We try to build readiness throughout the year to achieve the highest levels we can during annual training. So, if we miss a step, we don't always achieve what we are trying to do in a given year.

Thank you.

Mr. SCOTT. I am very concerned about what happens between now and October 1st and making sure that we get the agreement finished for you in a timely manner. I just hope that we are able to finish out the appropriations process sooner rather than later, especially with regard to the DOD.

And there are a tremendous number of things going on around the world, and we will be doing every American a big favor if we can get you an appropriation sooner rather than later. We know what we think we are going to have at the 716, but in the end, it is going to require the House and the Senate to come to an agreement and get that signature from the President.

So thank you for all that you do and look forward to seeing you.

Mr. WILSON. Again, Congressman Scott is correct on his issues. And another side consequence, it is always inspiring to me to see the number of people who commute long distances to drill. Okay? And they had air costs. They had accommodations costs. And then they had to change their flight plans. And these are dedicated people who it is just inspiring to see that they would travel across the country to come to drill in another State to keep their proficiency.

We now proceed to Congressman Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I hope this is not a breach of protocol. I do want to thank General Herbert, who is in the room, for your service and I also really want to thank you for how great a mentor you are and the ability to train and direct my current MLA [military legislative assistant] when she was working on your team, Sapna Sharma, who is in the room there blushing. But she is doing a great job. Thank you for your service.

If I could return to the permanent presence forward stationing versus rotational deployments. And, certainly, General Kadavy, if you could speak to what that impact is on the Guard, opportunities, costs, also General Luckey.

But let me start with another preface. I spent 5 years on Active Duty. I commend the men and women on Active Duty. I couldn't do it, because I couldn't envision raising a family for 20 years where I would have to move them six times. So I commend and I thank our Active Duty members.

But then I went to the Reserves, and it was even a more challenging lifestyle because of balancing my civilian job with my military. And, in fact, after 5 years as a Reserve aviator, I just couldn't do it. So I had the good fortune of being able to branch transfer to the JAG [Judge Advocate General] Corps, where I could align my civilian pursuits to my Reserve duties. And I know General Luckey knows all about that because he is an infantry lawyer himself.

So if you could just speak to sort of like the pluses and the minuses of rotational versus forward from the Guard and the Reserve perspective.

General KADAVY. From Army National Guard perspective, we see tremendous value to these rotational stationing. We talked a little bit about the enhanced forward presence. So we do a number of things. One, just from a soldier level, mobilizations are a retention tool for us. We get our best retention numbers out of units that mo-

bilize and deploy. It is because that is what our young soldiers are joining to do, and they want to be part of the Army and the Army's missions.

Two is, for us, because we don't do the turnover like the Active Component and all the PCSing [permanent change of station], these mobilizations, deployments, and exercises are really readiness enhancers, not, you know, consumption of readiness, because when our units return, they are still the units that we sent, and now they have this additional experience that they can't get anywhere else. So we find great value in that.

Third, from the standpoint of mobilizations and the Army overall, there is muscle memory that we must continue to work and utilize, and that is the mobilization process. How you take soldiers and formations from a non-mobilized status, get them through post-mobilization training and deploy. So those are all great things for the Army and value from the presence.

From the standpoint of cost, you know, the one thing I would note is that many of these missions are done in 12304 Bravo versus 12304. So, when you think about the premobilization training and things the States are used to under the previous 12304 model, you can't use the overseas contingency operations dollars to help prepare for that mobilization. And so that cost—because we have got to help them get ready and achieve the readiness levels they need at the time of mobilization so they can meet all timelines. That then comes out of the base, and those were things that we were not always estimating.

But I think we are learning. I looked at the G–3. I think we are learning a lot. A lot of these things are firsts. We got the 155 Armor Brigade Combat Team mobilizing today, going to Kuwait in a few months. General Anderson spoke about the 278 and sending battalions to do EFP. We are going to learn a lot.

Mr. BROWN. General Luckey, you might want to talk about——

General LUCKEY [continuing]. Yes, sir. So thank you for that.

Just very briefly, so I was in Lithuania and Poland the week before last. And to your direct point, we are already doing some rotation of civil affairs capabilities and other things in both of those locations as a part of other operations and activities. And I will just tell you I think that is minimal risk from a sustainable perspective. I can get you the cost figures if it is relevant, but it is a relatively small footprint right now that is rotating in and out of some of those locales.

The larger point, and I would put a little different spin on it, Congressman. As you well know, America's Army Reserve has a fairly significant forward presence—candidly, that is what it is—nonrotational, but a forward presence in Europe, because we have a lot of American citizens who have civilian jobs. And they work in Berlin, and they work, you know, in Bonn and other locations in Germany, and they also man our formations in civil affairs and signal capabilities, engineer capabilities, et cetera. So you have an extant capability set there already.

I will tell you, looking to the future—this is a conversation General Cavoli and I had last week or 2 weeks ago in Wiesbaden. I am not sure that, as we look at force structure from an Army Reserve perspective and from a total Army perspective, what we have

learned as we look through the Ready Force X construct, in terms of what enablers, what critical enablers are that theaters are going to need very quickly, I am not sure we necessarily got the right balance anymore for what General Anderson alluded to earlier as a full-spectrum decisive action threat as opposed to something less than that.

So we are already partnering both with Army, from a total force perspective, and also specifically with USAREUR [U.S. Army Europe], to see whether or not we should rethink about some of the roles, missions, and responsibilities of Army Reserve structure that is currently in and will stay in Europe. In other words, do we have the right MOSs [military occupational specialties] for what the Army needs today in Europe. And I think that is an open conversation we will continue to have.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, gentlemen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congressman Brown.

And this has been a terrific positive hearing. I appreciate it so much, and we appreciate your dedication and service. Mr. Warren has conducted well. And I want to thank Congresswoman Bordallo for her service as the ranking member of the subcommittee.

We are now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

April 19, 2018

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

April 19, 2018

Statement of the Honorable Joe Wilson
Chairman, Readiness Subcommittee

"Army Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request Readiness Posture"

April 19, 2018

Good morning. The subcommittee will come to order. I welcome you for this hearing of the House Armed Services Committee, Readiness Subcommittee, on: "The United States Army Readiness Posture."

Today the subcommittee will hear from 4 Army senior leaders regarding their service's fiscal year 2019 budget request and correlation to current and future readiness across the total Army. We are grateful to have the Regular Army component, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve so superbly represented – truly embodying the integration of the TOTAL ARMY. I want to take this opportunity to sincerely thank our witnesses for their service, a combined 144 years of experience is seated before us. Specifically, I want to explore the shortfalls, gaps, and critical challenges that lie ahead as you continue to implement the Army's readiness recovery plan. We also want to recognize the progress achieved thus far, and gain a better understanding of how the fiscal year 2019 budget request enables critical war fighting capabilities and life-cycle sustainment. Ultimately, how does this budget request support the Army mission and those men and women who wear the uniform and are in harm's way.

The fiscal year 2019 base and Overseas Contingency Operations budget request for total Army Operation and Maintenance includes $70 billion dollars, an approximate $4 billion dollars above the fiscal year 2108 National Defense Authorization Act amount. We appreciate the Army's prioritization of Readiness and efforts to train towards decisive action capabilities, increase global posture and capacity and lethality to defeat the threats identified in the National Defense Strategy, but we recognize there is more work to be done.

It is our responsibility as members of this subcommittee to understand the readiness situation and how the budget request impacts the Army in correcting deficiencies and restoring the capabilities this nation needs.

President Ronald Reagan frequently used the phrase, "Peace Through Strength." I agree with President Reagan and believe we must maintain a high state of readiness across our armed services in order to achieve that goal.

Needless to say, we have a lot of ground to cover this morning and I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today on varying aspects of Army readiness and concrete ways this committee can help.

Before I introduce the witnesses, I turn to Ranking Member Bordallo, the distinguished gentlelady from Guam, for opening comments she would like to make.

RECORD VERSION

STATEMENT BY

LIEUTENANT GENERAL JOSEPH ANDERSON
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY, G-3/5/7

AND

LIEUTENANT GENERAL AUNDRE PIGGEE
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY, G-4

AND

LIEUTENANT GENERAL TIMOTHY KADAVY
DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

AND

LIEUTENANT GENERAL CHARLES LUCKEY
CHIEF OF THE ARMY RESERVE

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SECOND SESSION, 115TH CONGRESS

ON READINESS

APRIL 19, 2018

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

Chairman Wilson, Ranking Member Bordallo, distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, we appreciate the opportunity to testify on the readiness of the United States Army. On behalf of our Secretary, the Honorable Mark Esper, and our Chief of Staff, General Mark Milley, thank you for your support and demonstrated commitment to our Soldiers, Army Civilians, Families, and Veterans.

In the last year, the world has become even more volatile and unpredictable. Today, the Army has over 178,000 Soldiers committed to supporting Combatant Commanders in more than 140 countries. The U.S. Army currently fills 50 percent of Combatant Command base force demand and 70 percent of emergent force demand. In real numbers, this is a 10 percent increase in global demand for forces from this time last year. Soldiers currently support 10 major named operations. In the current strategic environment typified by long-term strategic competition with other great powers, a continuing terrorist threat, disruptive technological advances, and budgetary uncertainty the Army remains the Nation's trained and ready ground combat force.

As other senior leaders have testified before Congress, we are at an inflection point where we can no longer ignore the eroding competitive advantages of our technologies and weapon systems. We appreciate the bipartisan effort that resulted in a two-year budget agreement for FYs 18 and 19. That type of certainty must continue well into the future so we can effectively plan and align our resources to our top priorities. As you are aware, the budget uncertainty imposed by the 2011 Budget Control Act, nine years of continuing resolutions, and two government shutdowns forced the Army to underinvest in readiness – it will take time for us to build that back.

In 2018 the Army will continue manning, training, and equipping the force to meet our goal: 66 percent of our fighting force ready to fight at a moment's notice. We must focus our training, equipping and manning priorities to meet the challenges of generating full-spectrum readiness, including mobilizing tens of thousands of Reserve Component Soldiers who can deploy to the fight in a matter of days and weeks. This work includes having sufficient, critical Army National Guard and Army Reserve enabler capabilities, and ensuring that there are no interoperability gaps in areas such as

mobility, lethality and mission command systems.

Providing a ready and lethal ground combat force will remain the Army's number one priority. The Army is focusing resources to maximize readiness on those units likely to respond to a possible contingency. We are focusing on increasing the integration of the Regular Army, Army National Guard and Army Reserve. We are also evaluating new force structure that will allow the Army to take advantage of changing technologies deterring near-peer competitors, and winning against violent extremists who would attack our homeland and allies.

Manning:

The Army provides a majority of the forces to support Combatant Commander requirements globally. As a result, U.S. Army forces are critical to the Nation's compete, deter, and win strategy. For example, in the Pacific, where we are deterring North Korean aggression and countering China's hegemonic aspirations, the Army provides nearly 80,000 Soldiers on a permanent basis, and nearly 24,000 Soldiers through rotational Armored Brigade Combat Teams, aviation units, field artillery units, and chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear defense capabilities. With these forces, the Army continues to strengthen its existing alliances and partnerships through exercises, such as Pacific Pathways, and programs such as the National Guard State Partnership Program. Bearing in mind that 20 of 27 Asian-Pacific countries' defense chiefs are Army Generals, U.S. Army forces are a natural fit to accomplish Defense objectives and attract new partners to work with the U.S. and achieve regional security objectives.

The fight against violent extremists will continue long into the future. Using the Security Force Assistance Brigades (SFABs), we will continue to work with partners and allies to contain these threats. The Army must continue to retain talented mid-grade Officers and Noncommissioned Officers to man these formations. The Army will deploy the first SFAB to Afghanistan this year. We activated the second SFAB in January and will activate a third Regular Army SFAB and an Army National Guard SFAB later this year. SFAB maneuver advisor teams will work with partner nations' militaries and will train and advise those forces in technical areas like fires, logistics,

maintenance, and EOD. The Army will build two more SFABs in 2019 with your continued support.

The National Defense Strategy focuses on the return of great-power competition. With this challenge comes a more lethal battlefield and a more technically capable adversary. To meet this, the Army is expanding, building and manning new units to meet the demand for cyber and EW capabilities and piloting new operating concepts, such as the Multi-Domain Taskforce (MDTF). The Army is leading the Department of Defense in cyberspace operations. This year, 66 percent of the Army's planned 62 Cyber Mission Force teams reached full operational capacity. The Multi-Domain Task Force, being piloted in U.S. Army Pacific Command, will help the Joint Force pierce and neutralize our adversaries' Anti-Access/Area-Denial envelope. Like the idea of prototyping, the MDTF exemplifies how the Army will pilot new force structures and operating concepts to explore how we can compete, deter, and win in an increasingly ambiguous and contested environment.

In this contemporary operating environment, the Army National Guard and Army Reserve comprise an operational force that Combatant Commanders rely on during all phases of conflict. To meet that demand, select Reserve units must be ready to deploy with little or no-notice. This expectation marks a new reality for the Army National Guard, a new era dubbed *ARNG 4.*0. A distinct break from the post-9/11 period that was characterized by rotational deployments for counterinsurgency operations, *ARNG 4.0* is an evolutionary shift that increases combat readiness and decreases response time.

To meet the requirements of *ARNG 4.0*, the Army National Guard instituted new manning constructs for select units in high demand by Combatant Commanders. Priority units are now authorized manpower in excess of 100 percent to build and sustain both combat readiness and domestic response, capabilities resourced through the Army Readiness Enhancement Account. This approach will field operational Army National Guard units, available to the Combatant Commanders overseas and responsive to the Governors of our States and Territories at home.

The Army Reserve is leaning forward to improve readiness and to leverage the unique skills that exist in the ranks. To ensure that critical capabilities such as aviation, engineer, medial, civil affairs, chemical, and logistics units are ready to deploy on compressed timelines, the Army Reserve has formed Ready Force X (RFX), a pool of units tasked with maintaining higher levels of readiness to deploy, enable, and fight in days and weeks. Further, the Army Reserve continually assesses its organizational structure to ensure that our force is postured to keep up with the fast pace of change in the private sector – in areas such as quantum computing, artificial intelligence, robotics, and materials science, medicine and genetic research and engineering to name a few. We continue to work closely with our partners within the private and public sectors such as Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUx), Military District 5 (MD5) and others that are committed to strengthening the partnership between "Main Street" America and your Army Reserve.

With your help, the Army is reversing manpower declines and addressing key capability gaps. The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) in FY17 authorized 1.018 million Soldiers for the Army. Among other things, the Army used those increases to fill shortages in undermanned combat units and close capability caps in air defense artillery and long range fires. The Army also made great progress in reducing the number of medically non-deployable Soldiers in our ranks. These two factors contributed to 21 Brigade Combat Teams being manned at 100 percent. The FY18 NDAA authorizes more growth. In order to recruit and train these new Soldiers, the Army needs enacted appropriations. Then in order to retain them, and grow them into the highly proficient mid-grade Leaders that distinguish the U.S. Army from other ground-combat formations, we need predictable funding so that they can continue their education and development.

Training:

In order to meet the goal of having 66 percent of its combat forces ready to meet war plan requirements between FY21 and FY23, the Army is focusing on optimizing training resources, improving the quality of training assessments and enhancing Reserve Component training, integration and responsiveness.

The Army recently implemented its new force generation model called Sustainable Readiness. Under Sustainable Readiness, the Army works to optimize readiness to meet known and contingency requirements for about 96 percent of the operating force. Using this we can shape efforts to increase training opportunities in a targeted manner across the force. Because of your support, the Army plans to conduct 19 Combat Training Center rotations in FY18 and 20 in FY19. This includes four rotations for the Army National Guard each year, doubling their number of Brigade Combat Team rotations. Beginning in 2018, the Army will hold two SFAB culminating training events a year. Additionally, 14 Reserve Component units are mid-way though the Associated Unit Pilot. There are favorable indications that this pilot is meeting its intent of increasing Reserve Component readiness and reducing enabler support challenges by establishing habitual relationships between RC and AC units.

Concurrently, the Army National Guard is adjusting traditional training models and shifting focus from counterinsurgency operations to core, decisive action functions as part of the Army's transition to Sustainable Readiness. In order to reduce the amount of training time they need upon mobilization, select units within the Army National Guard will require more than the standard 39 training days each year. Under *ARNG 4.0*, units in high demand will require 63 training days, or more, leading up to Combat Training Center rotations or overseas exercises, while the training tempo for other units remains steady. Many Soldiers may also have individual military education requirements of up to two weeks that add to their cumulative annual commitments. This increased training time is necessary for the Army National Guard to meet its obligations as the largest reserve force in the Department of Defense and as a reliable force provider to the Total Army.

Over the last year, the Army established a new standards based system designed to better measure any unit's readiness to deploy. This system is called Objective-T and it ensures a common understanding of how to apply these metrics across all components of the force. The Army is currently training under Objective T and the Army Reserve currently conducts Ready Force X focused operations, like Cold Steel which is a crew-served weapons gunnery exercise to meet Objective T readiness standards. Implementing Objective-T prior to Combat Support Training

Exercises and Combat Training Center rotations will ensure units and Soldiers are trained and ready to bring key enablers to the Army and that AC/RC integrated formations do not suffer from differing training standards when asked to rapidly deploy.

When the Army misses training opportunities due to budgetary uncertainty, continuing resolutions, or government shutdowns, we cannot recover that lost readiness. Losing training time, and the associated repetitions, field exercises, courses, and rehearsals cannot be bought back. Under current projections, by FY20, 90 percent of all regular Army BCTs will have completed three decisive action CTC rotations in the previous decade. However, if the Army must operate under a six month continuing resolution, 13 Brigade Combat Teams will enter their April-September CTC rotations at lower training levels due to reduced home station training. Alternatively, Commanders may decide to shift funds and preserve Brigade Combat Team training at the expense of maneuver enhancement and sustainment units.

Equipping/Sustaining:

Last year, the Army completed fielding the first increment of the Global Combat Support System – Army (GCSS-Army), which is improving materiel management for Army logisticians. They are capitalizing on the unprecedented data it is providing to improve readiness. The system was fielded to the Total Army -- all components at one time -- the first time that has been done in recent history.

We are balancing our capabilities across multiple threats and theaters by growing our Army Prepositioned Stocks (APS), and assembling them in ready-to-fight configurations around the globe. The stocks enable us to quickly equip and employ early-entry forces, assure our allies, and deter our enemies. In Europe, as the Army transitions from assurance to deterrence, we are adding a Fires Brigade and its associated enablers. This enhances the Army's lethality and demonstrates how we continue to work with NATO partners to improve response time in the event of Russian aggression. In Korea we have increased our sustainment assets to meet a "fight tonight" scenario and Pacific Command requirements for early-entry forces. We also are adding to Activity Sets in support of Africa, Southwest Asia, and South America as the strategic environment continues to shift.

We are addressing shortages of critical preferred munitions through efforts to reposition munitions and modernize the industrial base. We expanded production capacity at Holston Army Ammunition Plant in Tennessee, and we're beginning repair and upgrade programs to Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas and the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant in Oklahoma.

The Army's 23 organic industrial base (OIB) facilities have transitioned from peak war-time workload to support regionally aligned rotational forces and enduring operational requirements. The OIB needs consistent, predictable funding to preserve the capabilities of the highly trained workforce and to modernize facilities, equipment, and tooling. We request congressional support as we continue to align requirements and resources and strategically shape a ready OIB.

The Army is undertaking an ambitious effort to establish a new Futures Command. The sole purpose of this organization will be to make our Soldiers and units more lethal so they can fight and win our Nation's wars. To do this, they will develop, procure, and field next generation capabilities. This year, the Army will selectively upgrade the equipment we have and will focus our research funding on the six Army Modernization Priorities: long range precision fires, next generation combat vehicles, future vertical lift, the Army network, air and missile defense systems, and Soldier lethality.

Conclusion:

The Army remains ready to compete, deter, and if necessary fight and win tonight. However, sustaining readiness for today while modernizing to compete with near-peer adversaries in the future requires sufficient, consistent, and predictable funding. The Army's strength is its people, and the way to maximize that strength is by keeping those people trained and equipped. We need your continued support to satisfy our responsibilities to train America's sons and daughters for combat, to maintain a trained and ready ground force, and to be responsible stewards of our Nation's resources.

Lieutenant General Joseph Anderson
Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7
United States Army

Lieutenant General Joseph Anderson assumed the duties as the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7, Headquarters, Department of the Army, on 11 May 2015. His most recent assignment was as the Commanding General, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, North Carolina and Commander, International Security Assistance Force Joint Command (IJC) and Deputy Commanding General, US Forces – Afghanistan.

Lieutenant General Anderson received his commission in the Infantry Branch from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1981. He holds Masters Degree in Administration from Central Michigan University and National Security and Strategic Studies from the Naval War College.

During more than 34 years of service, Lieutenant General Anderson has been afforded many unique professional experiences and opportunities. He has commanded units from platoon to corps. Command assignments include: C Company, 2nd Battalion (Airborne), 187th Infantry Regiment, 193d Infantry Brigade, Fort Kobbe, Republic of Panama; 2d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Lewis, Washington; 2d Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina; 2d Brigade and 502d Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) at Fort Campbell, Kentucky; and 4th Infantry Division and Fort Carson, Colorado.

Other significant assignments include Aide-de-Camp to the Commanding General, United States Army Pacific, Fort Shafter, Hawaii; Professor, Joint Military Operations Department, College of Naval Warfare, Newport, Rhode Island; Chief of Staff, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Fort Campbell, Kentucky; Executive Officer, Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, Washington, DC; Chief of Staff, III Corps, Fort Hood, Texas; Chief of Staff, Multinational Corps-Iraq; Deputy Commanding General, U.S. Army Recruiting Command, Fort Knox, Kentucky; Chief of Staff, Multinational Force/United States Forces-Iraq; and Director, Operations, Readiness and Mobilization, Department of the Army; Washington, DC.

Lieutenant General Anderson's operational deployments and combat tours include Operation Just Cause, Task Force Hawk-Albania, Task Force Falcon-Kosovo, Operation Joint Guardian, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

His military education includes the Infantry Officer Basic and Advanced Courses, the Combined Arms Staff Service School, United States Army Command and Staff College, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the United States Naval War College.

Lieutenant General Anderson and his wife, Beth, have two sons: Marc and Michael.

Lieutenant General Aundre F. Piggee
Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4
U.S. Army

Lieutenant General Aundre F. Piggee assumed duties as the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4 on 23 September 2016. He oversees policies and procedures used by all Army Logisticians throughout the world. Prior to joining the Army staff he served as the Director of Logistics and Engineering, United States Central Command, MacDill AFB, FL.

Lieutenant General Piggee is a Native of Stamps, Arkansas. He commissioned into the United States Army in 1981 from the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff where he graduated as a Distinguished Military Graduate with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Biology. He has a Master of Science Degree in Material Acquisition Management from the Florida Institute of Technology and a Master's Degree in Military Strategy from the Army War College. Lieutenant General Piggee also received an Honorary Doctorate Degree in Doctor of Laws from the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.

His military education includes the Quartermaster Officer Basic Course, the Ordnance Officer Advance Course, Combined Arms Staff Services School, the Logistics Executive Development Course, the Command and General Staff College and the Army War College.

His most significant assignments include: Director of Logistics and Engineering, United States Central Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida; Commanding General, 21st Theater Sustainment Command, Kaiserslautern, Germany; Assistant Chief of Staff, J4 and Combined Forces Command, C4, United States Forces Korea, Seoul, South Korea; and Executive Officer to the Vice Chief of Staff, Army, the Pentagon.

Lieutenant General Piggee's other notable assignments include: Commander, 15th Sustainment Brigade, Fort Hood, Texas; Chief, Support Operation Division, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, 8th U.S. Army, Seoul, South Korea; Commander, Division Rear and Chief of Staff, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas; Commander, 15th Forward Support Battalion and 1st Cavalry Division, G4, Fort Hood, Texas.

Lieutenant General Piggee's awards and decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Defense Superior Service Medal (2 OLC), Legion of Merit (2 OLC), the Bronze Star, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Meritorious Service Medal (3 OLC), Army Commendation Medal (4 OLC), the Army Achievement Medal (3 OLC). He is authorized to wear the Department of Defense and Army Staff Identification Badges.

Lieutenant General Timothy J. Kadavy
Director, ARNG

Lieutenant General Timothy J. Kadavy assumed duties as the Director, Army National Guard, National Guard Bureau, Washington, District of Columbia on 27th March 2015. As Director, he guides the formulation, development and implementation of all programs and policies affecting the Army National Guard; a force of over 350,000 Soldiers in the 54 States, Territories and the District of Columbia.

Prior to his current assignment, General Kadavy served as the Special Assistant to the Vice Chief, National Guard Bureau, where he was responsible for representing the National Guard at key meetings and work sessions at the Department of Defense, Joint Staff and Inter-Agency level. General Kadavy also served as Commander, Combined Joint Inter-Agency Task Force – Afghanistan where he was responsible for coordinating and directing the effects for Counter/Anti-Corruption, Counter Narcotics, Counter Threat Financing. Prior to his deployment to Afghanistan, General Kadavy served as Deputy Director, Army National Guard and the Adjutant General of Nebraska.

General Kadavy received his commission from the University of Nebraska - Lincoln, Army Reserve Officers Training Corps on 12 May 1984. He has commanded at the Troop, Squadron and Task Force Level. He commanded Bravo Troop, 1st Battalion 167th Cavalry, First Squadron, 1st Battalion 167th Cavalry and the Northern United States Task Force - Stabilization Forces 13 (Task Force Huskers) in Operation Joint Forge, Bosnia Herzegovina. General Kadavy deployed to Iraq in 2006 and served as the Senior Reserve Component Advisor to the Commander Multi-National Corps - Iraq.

Lieutenant General Charles D. Luckey
Chief of Army Reserve and Commanding General, United States Army Reserve Command

Lieutenant General Charles D. Luckey assumed duty as the Chief of Army Reserve and Commanding General, United States Army Reserve Command on 30 June 2016.

As the Chief of Army Reserve and Commanding General, United States Army Reserve Command, he leads a community-based force of more than 200,000 Soldiers and Civilians with a "footprint" that includes 50 states, five territories, and more than 30 countries.

The Army Reserve is a critical force provider of trained and ready units and Soldiers providing full spectrum capabilities essential for the Army to fight and win wars and respond to homeland emergencies on behalf of the American people.

He was commissioned in the Army after graduating as a Distinguished Military Graduate from the University of Virginia in 1977. He began his military career as an Infantry Officer leading Soldiers in both mechanized and Special Forces units until separating from active duty in 1982 to attend law school. In 1985, he returned to active duty and served with the 82d Airborne, Ft. Bragg, NC. In 1991, he transferred to the Army Reserve and subsequently commanded units at the battalion, brigade, and group level, culminating with his assignment as the Commanding General of the 78th Division (TS).

He was recalled to active duty in 2008 and selected to serve as the Chief, Office of Security Cooperation in Baghdad, Iraq. Prior to his current assignment, he served as the Chief of Staff, North American Aerospace Defense Command and Northern Command and on the Joint Staff as Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for Reserve Matters.

As a civilian, Lieutenant General Luckey is a litigation partner in the firm of Blanco Tackabery & Matamoros P.A., located in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. As a partner of the firm, he concentrates his practice on a mixture of criminal, domestic and environmental matters in both State and Federal courts. He is admitted to practice law in an array of jurisdictions to include the Supreme Court of the United States.

Having served in a variety of theaters with three combat tours, his awards, badges and decorations are consistent with those of most Soldiers who have had the honor to serve the United States over a period of decades and the good fortune to return safely home. He's blissfully married to a Tar Heel, his wife Julie from Greensboro, North Carolina.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

April 19, 2018

INFORMATION PAPER

12 June 2018

SUBJECT: European Deterrence Initiative (EDI)

1. **Purpose:** Update House Armed Services Committee on the impacts and costs of EDI.

2. **Bottom Line:** The security situation in Europe requires an increased deterrence posture that exceeds current resources. The Army is dependent on EDI funds to facilitate additional posture initiatives in Eastern Europe to counter Russian aggression and assure NATO allies. Europe has seen significant changes over the past three years as a result of EDI investment.

3. **Background.**

a. **Rotations and Permanent Stationing**: EDI funds the full time rotation of an Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) with enablers, a Division Mission Command Element (MCE), combat aviation assets to augment theater aviation (providing a full Combat Aviation Brigade capability), as well as our responsibilities as a framework nation for NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence (eFP) Battle Group in Poland

b. **Proposed Enhancements**: EDI provides resources for the U.S. Army to demonstrate its combat power to Europe, improve interoperability with NATO allies, integrate the Total Army, and rehearse relevant war plans. The Army continues to meet the U.S. European Command (EUCOM) Commander's requirements for Europe in coordination with U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR) and has submitted proposed enhancements to the Office of the Secretary of Defense's Fiscal Year (FY) 19-23 Program Budget Review for improvements with Short Range Air Defense (SHORAD) Battalions (FY20), Combat Service Support Brigade Headquarters (FY19), and Corps Headquarters (FY TBD).

c. **Army Pre-Positioned Stocks (APS)**: APS funded through EDI significantly increases the speed in which the Army conducts Joint Reception, Staging, Onward Movement, and Integration (JRSOI) activities of contiguous United States based units in times of contingency to counter Russian aggression. The Army is pursuing configured to fight initiatives with our APS equipment to reduce the burden of To Accompany Troops (TAT) equipment. EDI funding is used to enhance and modernize prepositioned equipment, including ABCTs, critical air defense launchers, and long range fires artillery. The 2 x ABCTs in APS-2 when combined with the rotational ABCT provide USAREUR the armored division capability necessary to deter Russian aggression in Europe.

d. **Military Construction (MILCON)**: EDI funded military construction projects address mobility through improvements to railheads, increased capacity of bulk fuel and ammunition storage facilities, and other enhancements to staging areas in Easter Europe to improve intra-theater mobility to move forces where they are needed quickly.

e. **Guard and Reserve**: EDI also enables the Army's efforts to build partner capacity for newer NATO members and increases the capability of USAREUR through the provision of more than 1,000 man-years of mobilized Reserve Component (RC) Soldiers (10 USC 12304b authority). RC support is planned across the Future Years Defense Program at similar levels to FY19.

WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING

April 19, 2018

RESPONSE TO QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. BROWN

General ANDERSON. For the last year, the Army and the United States European Command (USEUCOM) have conducted substantive studies of the long term costs of rotational versus forward station presence, concluding an Army G–8 study in May 2017, in response to an earlier USEUCOM effort from 2016–2017. The conclusions of these studies are as follows: The 2017 USEUCOM analysis of the costs to forward station versus rotate an Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) to Europe concluded that it was less expensive to forward station. The report based its conclusions on the assumption that a forward stationed ABCT "in theater" would fully meet the US obligation, and did not address the requirement to maintain a 1.0 ABCT forward presence in Eastern Europe. If the ABCT is stationed in Germany (instead of Poland), it does not meet the requirement and rotational forces are still required. To maintain acceptable bog/dwell ratios would still require 2x ABCTs from the U.S. to deploy to Poland after the forward stationed ABCT completes its nine month rotation and enters its 18 month dwell. Army G–8 analysis factored all relevant transportation, personnel, permanent change of station (PCS), family support, and Operations & Sustainment costs for each scenario and determined that, 1) Rotational ABCT in Poland costs ~$565M/year (total $2.825B for Fiscal Years 2019–23); 2) Forward stationed ABCT in Germany and deploying from there (nine months) followed by two rotations of contiguous United States-based ABCT (to support 1:2 dwell) costs ~$734M/year (total $3.672 for FYs 19–23); 3) U.S. Army could fund seven years of rotational presence in Poland for the cost of five years of forward stationing; and 4) The Army study concluded that there is no cost advantage inherent to forward stationing an ABCT in Germany. U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR) continues to analyze and develop stationing options to accommodate potential growth coming from the Total Army Analysis 20–24. It is the current position of USAREUR that adding a permanently stationed ABCT would do little to increase its deterrence posture, and that any valuable basing space would be better utilized housing necessary combat enablers. European Defense Initiative (EDI) funds enable the National Guard and Army Reserve, independent of forward stationed or rotational force, to support the Army's efforts to build partner capacity for newer NATO members and increase USAREUR's capability, which is essential to meeting the sustainment demands of the deterrence mission in Europe. Reserve Component support is planned across the Future Years Defense Program at similar levels to FY19. Please see attached Army EDI Information Paper for additional context. [See pages 14 and 45.]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING

April 19, 2018

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. What is the status of the SEP report on the efforts of the Army to reduce the weight of personal protective equipment (PPE) and organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE) which was directed in the FY17 NDAA? It is our understanding that the 25th ID has completed the field testing and the report has been compiled. Representative Scott would like to receive a copy of the SEP report on the efforts of the Army to reduce the weight of personal protective equipment (PPE) and organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE).

General ANDERSON. As requested, we will provide your office a copy of the briefing which was sent to all four defense oversight committees and briefed to House Armed Services Committee professional staff members in July, 2017, as required by House Report 114–537.

[The briefing referred to is retained in the committee files.]